

## Restoration- Cedar Ridge (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700475

### A. List of Restoration Activities

#### General Project Description

The Cedar Ridge OHV Restoration Planning grant proposal requests funds needed to complete the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis/decision documentation and funds for implementation of a restoration project near Twain Harte on the Mi-Wok Ranger District. The funding request covers all aspects of project planning: developing the proposed action, public scoping, resource surveys, analysis, evaluation and reports, and documentation of the decision. An estimate (based on other similar projects with similar activities) of the funding needed to implement the project is also part of the proposal.

The project, located northwest of the community of Twain Harte off of Keltz Mine Road (3N02), 3N52, and 3N51Y, consists of 4 separate sites located within the Five Mile Creek drainage, a tributary to the South Fork Stanislaus River. Each project site is heavily used for OHV recreation, incurring resource damage by motor vehicles on a regular basis. 4WDs, ATVs, and motorcycles travel off adjacent National Forest Transportation System (NFTS) roads and trails adversely impacting steep slopes and hillsides. Additionally, unauthorized OHV (ATV/Motorcycle) tracks have developed in these areas over the past 10 years. The project area consists mostly of highly erosive clay soils.

The District has used allocated California OHV Law Enforcement funds in the past to install no motor vehicle signs within the project area in an attempt to restrict vehicles to NFTS roads and trails and to keep vehicles out of environmentally sensitive areas and off steep hillside slopes. Signs have been ineffective in gaining compliance due to easy access into these areas and a lack of physical or natural barriers.

Upon completion and issuance of a signed NEPA decision, project implementation activities will include restoration and permanent closure of approximately 5 acres of impact area and 3 miles of user created OHV routes, placement of approximately 1000 feet of barriers, and installation of regulatory and information signs in the project area. Area will remain open to non-motorized uses, including hiking beyond any physical barriers.

The project is located adjacent to the recently completed Cedar Ridge/Mt. Elizabeth OHV Restoration Project

### B. Describe how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation and how OHV Recreation caused the damage:

#### Analysis of Needs and Benefits

Approval of this planning/implementation request will enable the District to complete the necessary NEPA documentation and allow for project implementation. Both Forest Service specialist and local environmental groups and individuals have recommended this restoration project. Volunteers have worked on similar projects in the past and will be solicited to reduce overall implementation costs.

If the proposed project is delayed, adverse resource impacts will continue, potentially requiring a much larger restoration project in the future. By treating the localized area while protecting sensitive resources and providing public education to users, general OHV use in the surrounding area on designated NFTS routes can continue. Without the Cedar Ridge restoration project - if additional damage occurs, the entire area could be closed to OHV use, dispersed camping, and day use parking.

Implementation of this project will restore general forest areas (mixed coniferous) to a near natural setting enhancing wildlife, plant, and aquatic habitat, protecting cultural resources, and reducing soil loss and sedimentation into both Five Mile Creek and the South Fork Stanislaus River.

Additionally, this project will prevent off-route travel by placing physical barriers adjacent to NFTS routes, restricting motor vehicle access to the NFTS and out of sensitive areas. Restoration of unauthorized user created trails will be completed as

well. Reduced violations by OHV users may result as planned barriers are less susceptible to vandalism and will reinforce the vehicle-restricted areas.

**C. Describe the size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles**

Approximately 15 acres of impact area will be planned for and treated in the Cedar Ridge Restoration Project. Route decommissioning will consist of approximately three miles of route.

**D. Monitoring and Methodology**

Project monitoring will include completion of impact area condition surveys and creation of a photo log to document area prior to project implementation. Additional photos will be taken at project completion and annually thereafter to document changes in project over time. Condition surveys will be completed every three years or as need is determined. Any vandalism or incursions at site will be documented as well.

**E. List of Reports**

List of Reports & Documents to be produced:

1. Statement of detailed Proposed Action
2. Draft and final Specialist Analyses and Reports
3. Draft Decision Document
4. Final Decision Document
5. Project Monitoring File
6. Photos

All materials associated with the project will become part of the project record available for public review upon request.

**F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews**

The Cedar Ridge Restoration Planning and Implementation Project do not involve scientific or cultural studies. The project area has been surveyed in the past for cultural resources. Review of past efforts will determine if protection/mitigation measures will be necessary during project implementation to protect cultural resources.

**G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area**

Monitoring of project will include routine patrols by FS LEOs and FPOs. District recreation staff will document any vandalism and intrusion into project area and will be responsible for scheduling and the completion of any repair needs.

Both enforcement and educational signs will be installed informing the visiting public of the project and reasons for implementation. Additionally, the FS plans on attending the annual Cedar Ridge Homeowners Spring Meeting to discuss purpose and need for project and provide information on legitimate OHV use on National Forest System Lands.

## Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700475

**1. Project-Specific Maps**

Attachments:

[Cedar Ridge OHV Restoration Project Site Map](#)

**2. Project-Specific Photos**

Attachments:

[Cedar Ridge OHV Restoration Project Photos](#)

## Project Cost Estimate

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____				
<b>APPLICANT NAME :</b>	USFS - Stanislaus National Forest						
<b>PROJECT TITLE :</b>	Restoration- Cedar Ridge (FINAL)	<b>PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :</b>	G09-02-19-R04				
<b>PROJECT TYPE :</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration						
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION :</b>	<p>General Project Description</p> <p>The Cedar Ridge OHV Restoration Planning grant proposal requests funds needed to complete the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis/decision documentation and funds for implementation of a restoration project near Twain Harte on the Mi-Wok Ranger District. The funding request covers all aspects of project planning: developing the proposed action, public scoping, resource surveys, analysis, evaluation and reports, and documentation of the decision. An estimate (based on other similar projects with similar activities) of the funding needed to implement the project is also part of the proposal.</p> <p>The project, located northwest of the community of Twain Harte off of Keltz Mine Road (3N02), 3N52, and 3N51Y, consists of 4 separate sites located within the Five Mile Creek drainage, a tributary to the South Fork Stanislaus River. Each project site is heavily used for OHV recreation, incurring resource damage by motor vehicles on a regular basis. 4WDs, ATVs, and motorcycles travel off adjacent National Forest Transportation System (NFTS) roads and trails adversely impacting steep slopes and hillsides. Additionally, unauthorized OHV (ATV/Motorcycle) tracks have developed in these areas over the past 10 years. The project area consists mostly of highly erosive clay soils.</p> <p>The District has used allocated California OHV Law Enforcement funds in the past to install no motor vehicle signs within the project area in an attempt to restrict vehicles to NFTS roads and trails and to keep vehicles out of environmentally sensitive areas and off steep hillside slopes. Signs have been ineffective in gaining compliance due to easy access into these areas and a lack of physical or natural barriers.</p> <p>Upon completion and issuance of a signed NEPA decision, project implementation activities will include restoration and permanent closure of approximately 5 acres of impact area and 3 miles of user created OHV routes, placement of approximately 1000 feet of barriers, and installation of regulatory and information signs in the project area. Area will remain open to non-motorized uses, including hiking beyond any physical barriers.</p> <p>The project is located adjacent to the recently completed Cedar Ridge/Mt. Elizabeth OHV Restoration Project</p>						
	<b>Line Item</b>	<b>Qty</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>UOM</b>	<b>Grant Request</b>	<b>Match</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>							
<b>Program Expenses</b>							
1	<b>Staff</b>						

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - Stanislaus National Forest  
Application: Restoration- Cedar Ridge (FINAL)

2/25/2010

Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
Other-Management/Admin Staff (Planning) Notes : All management and administrative costs for project will be FS match.	2.000	400.000	DAY	0.00	800.00	800.00
Other-OHV/Recreation Staff (Planning) Notes : OHV/Recreation staff will serve as project lead/interdisciplinary team leader on project.	10.000	310.000	DAY	3,100.00	0.00	3,100.00
Other-Botanist (Planning) Notes : Interdisciplinary Team Member	6.000	310.000	DAY	1,550.00	310.00	1,860.00
Other-Wildlife Biologist (Planning) Notes : Interdisciplinary Team Member	6.000	310.000	DAY	1,550.00	310.00	1,860.00
Other-Hydrologist/Soils (Planning)	6.000	310.000	DAY	1,550.00	310.00	1,860.00
Other-Archaeologist (Planning) Notes : Interdisciplinary Team Member	6.000	310.000	DAY	1,550.00	310.00	1,860.00
Other-Management/Admin Staff (Implementa Notes : All management and administrative costs for project will be FS match.	1.000	400.000	DAY	0.00	400.00	400.00
Other-OHV/Rec Technician (Implementation	15.000	310.000	DAY	4,650.00	0.00	4,650.00
Other-OHV/Rec Technician (Implementation	15.000	280.000	DAY	4,200.00	0.00	4,200.00
Other-LEO (Monitoring) Notes : Project monitoring and enforcement	10.000	440.000	DAY	0.00	4,400.00	4,400.00
Other-FPO (Monitoring) Notes : Project monitoring and enforcement	15.000	310.000	DAY	2,325.00	2,325.00	4,650.00
Other-OHV/Rec Volunteers (Implementation	15.000	156.000	DAY	0.00	2,340.00	2,340.00
Other-Sign Crew (Implementation) Notes : Installation of project signing	2.000	570.000	DAY	1,140.00	0.00	1,140.00
Recreation Planner	1.000	324.000	DAY	324.00	0.00	324.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - Stanislaus National Forest  
Application: Restoration- Cedar Ridge (FINAL)

2/25/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Other-District Ranger	1.000	480.000	DAY	0.00	480.00	480.00
	Other-Hydrology Tech (Planning)	15.000	310.000	DAY	3,100.00	1,550.00	4,650.00
	<b>Total for Staff</b>				25,039.00	13,535.00	38,574.00
<b>2</b>	<b>Contracts</b>						
	Other-Backhoe w/Operator	5.000	800.000	DAY	4,000.00	0.00	4,000.00
<b>3</b>	<b>Materials / Supplies</b>						
	Other-Printing of letters/maps/doc. (Pla	500.000	0.500	EA	0.00	250.00	250.00
	Other-Postage (Planning)	500.000	0.440	EA	0.00	220.00	220.00
	Other-Newspaper Legal Notice (Planning)	2.000	200.000	EA	400.00	0.00	400.00
	Signs Notes : (e.g., fiberglass post with decals)	50.000	30.000	EA	1,500.00	0.00	1,500.00
	Signs Notes : (e.g., approx. 24X24 inch project information, education, and enforcement signing)	10.000	100.000	EA	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
	Signs Notes : (e.g., approx. 48X48 inch project information, education, and enforcement signing)	2.000	300.000	EA	600.00	0.00	600.00
	Other-Barriers (Rock) Notes : Purchase and delivery of rock boulder barriers to project site	260.000	40.000	MISC	10,400.00	0.00	10,400.00
	Other-Supplies Notes : Misc. supplies (e.g., concrete, bolts, paint)	1000.000	1.000	MISC	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
	Other-Tools Notes : Misc. tools and equipment (e.g., shovels, powersaw, drill)	250.000	1.000	MISC	250.00	0.00	250.00
	Other-Barrier Post	75.000	40.000	EA	3,000.00	0.00	3,000.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - Stanislaus National Forest  
Application: Restoration- Cedar Ridge (FINAL)

2/25/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Notes : 8X8X42 inch posts						
	Other-Wood Straw (Erosion Control) Notes : Weed free wood straw (Erosion Control and soil stabilization)	200.000	30.000	EA	6,000.00	0.00	6,000.00
	Other-Silt Fence Notes : Silt fence erosion control and soil stablization	10.000	35.000	EA	350.00	0.00	350.00
	<b>Total for Materials / Supplies</b>				24,500.00	470.00	24,970.00
<b>4</b>	<b>Equipment Use Expenses</b>						
	Other-FOR- 4WD Truck	40.000	14.000	DAY	0.00	560.00	560.00
	Other-Mileage- 4WD Truck	40.000	20.000	DAY	0.00	800.00	800.00
	Other-Mileage- 4WD Truck (LE)	10.000	20.000	DAY	0.00	200.00	200.00
	Other-FOR- 4WD Truck (LE)	10.000	20.000	DAY	0.00	200.00	200.00
	Skid Steer Loader	3.000	150.000	DAY	0.00	450.00	450.00
	<b>Total for Equipment Use Expenses</b>				0.00	2,210.00	2,210.00
<b>5</b>	<b>Equipment Purchases</b>						
<b>6</b>	<b>Others</b>						
<b>7</b>	<b>Indirect Costs</b>						
	Indirect Costs-Administrative Costs Notes : (10% administrative cost)	1.000	5300.000	MISC	0.00	5,300.00	5,300.00
	<b>Total Program Expenses</b>				53,539.00	21,515.00	75,054.00
	<b>TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES</b>				53,539.00	21,515.00	75,054.00
	<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>				<b>53,539.00</b>	<b>21,515.00</b>	<b>75,054.00</b>

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - Stanislaus National Forest  
Application: Restoration- Cedar Ridge (FINAL)

2/25/2010

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>					
<b>Program Expenses</b>					
1	Staff	25,039.00	13,535.00	38,574.00	
2	Contracts	4,000.00	0.00	4,000.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	24,500.00	470.00	24,970.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	2,210.00	2,210.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	5,300.00	5,300.00	
<b>Total Program Expenses</b>		53,539.00	21,515.00	75,054.00	
<b>TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES</b>		53,539.00	21,515.00	75,054.00	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>		<b>53,539.00</b>	<b>21,515.00</b>	<b>75,054.00</b>	



## Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700475

### ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

#### ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
(Please select Yes or No)

#### ITEM 2

- b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

### ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

- c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

### ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

### ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

### ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

### ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

### ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

### ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

### ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

**CEQA/NEPA Attachment**

## Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700475

### 1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 76% or more (10 points)  
☐ 51% - 75% (5 points)  
☒ 26% - 50% (3 points)  
☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

### 2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 18

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Domestic water supply (4 points)  
☐ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points )  
☒ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)  
☒ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)  
☒ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [4]  
☐ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species  
☒ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species [3]

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

Cedar Ridge is located within the Five Mile Creek drainage, a tributary to the South Fork Stanislaus River and a significant water supply source for New Melones Reservoir. Currently, OHV activities are causing erosion and runoff directly into the Five Mile Creek drainage, potentially affecting the South Fork of the Stanislaus River downstream.

Denuded barren impact areas have reduced riparian and meadow habitat due to continued motorized vehicle use into these areas, has compacted soil around confers, and has removed natural vegetation and leaf/needle cover for erosion control and soil stabilization.

Wildlife (e.g., deer, goshawk, spotted owl) and plant (e.g., fawn lily) habitat will be restored to a more natural condition and motor vehicle use eliminated.

### 3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)  
☒ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)  
☐ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)

- ☐ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
- ☐ Management decision (1 point)
- ☐ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
- ☐ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

Project NEPA analysis and decision is part of this funding request. Project need identified during Forest Service Dispersed Campsite Inventories, OHV Route Condition Surveys, and during public comment and scoping for the Stanislaus NF Motorized Travel Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement (EIS Nov. 2009).

**4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.**

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 12

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- ☒ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- ☒ Use of native plants and materials
- ☒ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- ☒ Educational signage
- ☒ Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

Site monitoring will include regular condition reports, photo documentation, and LE incident reports. All monitoring will be accomplished during regular FS patrols in project area.

Project focus is the construction and installation of barriers to prevent further site damage by controlling vehicle access.

Native materials (rock boulder and/or wood post) will be used for barriers and native vegetation (e.g., trees, shrubs, plants) will be utilized for recovery in barren or denuded areas.

Interpretive materials and signs will be designed, constructed and installed at the project site to inform the public of the restoration needs.

OHV use will be re-directed to appropriate/legal OHV routes in the area.

Restoration Best Management Practices are utilized on all Forest projects.

**5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.**

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

Publicly reviewed plans include the 1991 Stanislaus National Forest Land Management Plan, as amended; 1998 Stanislaus National Forest Motor Vehicle Travel Management Forest Plan Amendment; 2009 Motorized Travel Management - Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Site specific NEPA analysis and decision are part of this funding request. Public scoping and involvement is part of the process and will be conducted as required.

**6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.**

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)  
☐ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)  
☐ Other Grant funding (2 points)  
☐ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

Future operational costs to be minimal (related only to monitoring of restoration). Out year Agency operational budget not yet developed. Previous Agency budgets include funding for this purpose.

**7. Public Input - Q 7.**

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)  
☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)  
☒ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The Cedar Ridge Restoration Planning and Implementation Project was developed as part of the 2010 Off-Highway Vehicle Grant Application. Public scoping and involvement was solicited to share the grant application and to seek comments and feedback. Recent contacts with local interested parties, homeowner association, and stakeholders confirmed continued project support. During the Stanislaus NF Travel Management Project, public comments included motor vehicle closure and restoration within the project area.

**8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.**

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 4 or more (4 points) ☐ 2 to 3 (2 points)  
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center (CSERC), Mule Deer Foundation, Merced Dirt Riders, Tri-County Off- Road Club, and Mi-Wok OHV Volunteers.

**9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.**

9. Scientific and cultural studies will

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)  
☐ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)  
☐ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)  
☐ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

**10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.**

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

The specific NEPA planning process to consider alternatives and document the ultimate decision is part of this funding request. Implementation proposal includes physical barriers to confine motorized vehicle access to NFTS routes and elimination of motorized vehicle in areas being restored.

**11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.**

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)

☐ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)

☐ Less than 1 acre (1 points)

☐ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)